Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	Δ

JASON LEVETTE WASHINGTON, Plaintiff,

v.

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. <u>17-cv-05616-CRB</u>

ORDER DISMISSING CLAIMS WITH PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO **PROSECUTE**

On September 28, 2017, Plaintiff Jason Washington sued Alameda County, certain County officials, and the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART). See Complaint (dkt. 1). On August 9, 2018, the Court dismissed Washington's claims against Alameda County, Sheriff Ahern, and Deputy Panconi for failure to prosecute after Washington failed to file a response to the Court's order to show cause. See Order Granting Mot. to Dismiss (dkt. 52). BART now attests that "[t]here has been no activity on the case in more than 523 days" and moves to dismiss for lack of prosecution. See BART Mot. to Dismiss (dkt. 63) at 3. Washington's response was due by December 2, 2020, but Washington did not file a response. On December 4, 2020, the Court ordered Washington to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. See OSC (dkt. 65). Washington's response was due Friday, December 11, 2020. Id. Once again, Washington did not file a response.

Therefore, Washington's claims against all remaining Defendants, including BART, are hereby dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute under Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th

Case 3:17-cv-05616-CRB Document 66 Filed 12/15/20 Page 2 of 2

	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
	10
	11
ifornia	12
	13
f Cal	14
thern District or	15
	16
	17
Nor	18
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25

United States District Court

opportunities to do so. See id.
motions to dismiss for failure to prosecute, and (2) respond to orders giving him further
of dismissal considering Washington's lack of activity and repeated failure to (1) oppose
Washington's undue delay, and the availability of less drastic sanctions all weigh in favor
the court's need to manage its docket, the risk of prejudice to the Defendants caused by
Cir. 1986). The Court finds that the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 15, 2020

